UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,940	09/29/2006	Ya Xu	2006-1228A	6659
	7590 03/10/201 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Stree Suite 400 East		VAN OUDENAREN, SARAH A		
Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/10/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/587,940	XU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SARAH VAN OUDENAREN	1793	

	SARAH VAN OUDENAREN	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la</li> <li>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a company of the company o	er form for appeal by materially rec		ne issues for
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 2,3,5,6,9,12,13,15,16,18-21,23,24,26 all Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	φlanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.  Other:			
/Melvin Curtis Mayes/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793	/SARAH VAN OUDEN/ Examiner, Art Unit 1793	AREN/	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments have cancelled the previous claims towards a catalyst and now only relate them to a method of using the catalyst. Further, the method claim that was previously presented has been substantially amended to include the catalyst and a method of making the catalyst which was not previously considered. Further consideration is needed. Applicant argues that the art of record does not teach Ni3Al as a catalyst, however examiner disagrees. The catalytyic properties of Ni3Al are disclosed by Lessing and used to modify Takuya and Shaw. Further, applicant argues that the invention of record is different insofar as the instant invention examined the catalytic activity of single phase Ni3Al and found that alkali-leached Ni3Al shows a high activity for metahnol decomposition. However, such limitations are not represented in the claim language. The comprising language of the claim is still considered by examiner to be met by the rejection of record. Regarding the rejection over claims 23-24, applicant is seemingly arguing unexpected results regarding the superior results achieved in accordance with the present invention. Further evidence is required in order for such an argument to be persuasive. The argument and subsequently the response is substantially similar to that of the instant claim 21.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the previously presented claims to a catalyst have been cancelled and the claimed subject matter is now towards a methanol reforming method. The method that was previously presented has been amended and would require further consideration. Applicant argues that as the method was previously examined the amendments should be entered, however, the previously presented method has been significantly amended to include the method of making the catalyst. Applicant argues further that .